



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,400	03/15/2004	Yukikazu Mori	2271/60883-A	1661
7590		12/18/2007		
Ivan S. Kavrukov				
Cooper & Dunham LLP				
1185 Avenue of the Americas				
New York, NY 10036				
			EXAMINER	
			LEE, TOMMY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,400

Applicant(s)

MORI, YUKIKAZU

Examiner

Thomas D. Lee

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 21-29, 33-35, 40-53 and 56 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11, 15, 19, 30-32, 36-39, 54, 55, 57 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office action is responsive to Applicant's "Amendment in response to July 11, 2007 Office Action," filed October 3, 2007. Claims 1-19 and 21-58 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed in response to the rejection of claims 9, 15, 19, 20, 36-38, 55, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,618,749 (Saito et al., hereinafter Saito) in view of U.S. Patent 6,043,904 (Nickerson), and claims 11, 30-32, 39 and 54 as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Nickerson and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,134,501 (Satomi et al., hereinafter Satomi), as set forth in the prior Office action mailed July 11, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. In response to the prior rejections, Applicant has amended independent claims 9, 15, 19, 30, 36, 54, 55, 57 and 58 to now recite registration of a destination address in delivery notifying partner storing means, prior to reception of electronic delivery confirmation mail. Applicant asserts that there is no teaching or suggestion of this limitation in the cited prior art. In particular, Applicant cites Nickerson (column 2, lines 38-65), and states confirmation destinations are specified in a job ticket which accompanies a print job transmitted from the job originating station to the printing device, but the confirmation destination is not registered in a memory or storage means of the network facsimile device, prior to reception of the mail delivery notification (amendment, pages 25-26). Contrary to Applicant's assertion, Nickerson does disclose

storage of confirmation destinations prior to reception of the mail delivery notification.

Noting Fig. 9, Nickerson, upon decision that a confirmation page is to be e-mailed (step 152), the confirmation page is transmitted to a *prestored* location address (step 154). At column 10, lines 53-60, Nickerson states: "Pursuant to transmitting the confirmation information, it is determined, by way of step 152, if any of the one or more confirmation destinations of the page ticket relate to an E-Mail address. If E-Mail is called for, then the *stored* E-Mail address(es) are accessed (step 154) for transmitting a copy of a confirmation page by way of the network, to one or more *predesignated* E-Mail addresses." (emphasis added). Accordingly, the above rejections are maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 9, 15, 19, 36-38, 55, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Nickerson.

Regarding claim 9, Saito discloses a network facsimile device connected to an Internet or a local area network, employing an electronic mail function, and having a function of exchanging image information through said Internet or said local area network and functions of a facsimile device, comprising: delivery notifying partner storing means for detecting at a time of receiving electronic mail, whether the received electronic mail is an electronic delivery confirmation mail for confirming mail delivery (Internet facsimile and e-mail reception method (note title); delivery status notification

mail recognition section judges whether or not received data contains any delivery status notification message (column 8, lines 7-16)).

Saito does not disclose delivery notifying partner storing means for storing a mail address of a destination address to which a confirmation is to be delivered, in combination with delivery confirmation mail processing means for confirming whether predetermined contents relating to a transferring error are included in said detected electronic delivery confirmation mail and for transferring said electronic delivery confirmation mail to the destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means, when said predetermined contents relating to said transferring error are included in said electronic delivery confirmation mail; and for visibly outputting the contents of said electronic delivery confirmation mail, and wherein said destination address is registered in said delivery notifying partner storing means, prior to reception of said electronic delivery confirmation mail. However, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112). Said destination address is registered in said delivery notifying partner storing means, prior to reception of said electronic delivery confirmation mail (Fig. 9, step 154; column 10, lines 53-60). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job

was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

Regarding claim 15, Saito discloses a method of controlling a network facsimile device connected to the Internet or a local area network, employing a function of exchanging image information through said Internet or said local area network and functions of a facsimile device, comprising the steps of: detecting, at a time of receiving an electronic mail, whether said received electronic mail is an electronic delivery confirmation mail for confirming delivery of electronic mail (Internet facsimile and e-mail reception method (note title); delivery status notification mail recognition section judges whether or not received data contains any delivery status notification message (column 8, lines 7-16)); and confirming, when said received electronic mail is an electronic delivery confirmation mail, whether predetermined contents relating to a transferring error are included in said electronic delivery confirmation mail (delivery status notification mail includes a delivery status notification message indicating that the data received is delivery status notification mail a (column 6, lines 14-24); delivery status notification mail identification section judges the received data (column 6, lines 25-30) and specific information extraction section extracts information on the success/failure of delivery (column 6, lines 31-38)).

Saito does not disclose registering a delivery notifying destination mail address, prior to receiving said electronic delivery confirmation mail, in combination with transferring said electronic delivery confirmation mail to said stored destination mail address, when said predetermined contents relating to said transferring error are included in said contents of said electronic delivery confirmation mail. However, as mentioned above with respect to claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). A delivery notifying destination mail address is registered, prior to receiving said electronic delivery confirmation mail (Fig. 9, step 154; column 10, lines 53-60). Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

Claim 19 is a method claim corresponding to above apparatus claim 9, and is thus rejected for the reasons set forth above.

Regarding claim 36, Saito discloses a network facsimile device connected to a network, comprising: mailer means for transmitting and/or receiving electronic mail through the network, the electronic mail being accompanied by a facsimile image representation (Internet facsimile and e-mail reception method (note title)); mail detecting means for determining whether a received mail is a delivery notification, upon reception of the received mail (delivery status notification mail recognition section judges whether or not received data contains any delivery status notification message (column 8, lines 7-16)); determining means for determining whether a received delivery notification contains error information which indicates an error occurrence (delivery status notification mail includes a delivery status notification message indicating that the data received is delivery status notification mail (column 6, lines 14-24); delivery status notification mail identification section judges the received data (column 6, lines 25-30) and specific information extraction section extracts information on the success/failure of delivery (column 6, lines 31-38)); and outputting means for transferring said received delivery notification to a destination address and visibly outputting the contents of a delivery notification when the determining means determines that the received delivery notification contains error information (information is output visibly as one page (column 6, lines 27-30; Figs. 7 and 8)).

While Saito discloses determination of received mail to be a delivery notification, Saito does not disclose memory means for storing a registered destination address to which a mail delivery notification is to be sent, wherein said destination address is registered in said memory means prior to reception of said received delivery notification.



However, as mentioned above regarding claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). A delivery notifying destination mail address is registered, prior to receiving said electronic delivery confirmation mail (Fig. 9, step 154; column 10, lines 53-60). Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

Claim 37 further recites mail transferring means for transferring the received delivery notification to the sender address. As mentioned above regarding claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step

114). Obviously, any destination address capable of receiving electronic mail can be stored in the facsimile apparatus.

Claim 38 further recites setting means for making valid or invalid the transferring operation of said mail transferring means. Nickerson provides for local confirmation of the transmission job if remote confirmation is not invoked (Fig. 7, steps 110, 112). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide means for making valid or invalid the electronic transferring operation so that a user can immediately receive results of the transmission, whether locally or at a remote location.

Regarding claim 55, Saito discloses a network facsimile apparatus comprising: a mailer part configured to transmit and/or receive electronic mail through the network, the electronic mail being accompanied by a facsimile image representation (Internet facsimile and e-mail reception method (note title)); a detecting part configured to determine whether a received mail is a delivery notification, upon reception of the received mail (delivery status notification mail recognition section judges whether or not received data contains any delivery status notification message (column 8, lines 7-16)); a processing part configured to determine whether a received delivery notification contains error information which indicates an error occurrence, and transfer the received delivery notification to the destination address (the delivery status notification mail includes a delivery status notification message indicating that the data received is delivery status notification mail (column 6, lines 14-24); the delivery status notification mail identification section judges the received data (column 6, lines 25-30) and specific information extraction section extracts information on the success/failure of delivery

(column 6, lines 31-38)), and visibly output the contents of the received delivery notification when said processing part determines that the received delivery notification contains error information (information is output visibly as one page (column 6, lines 27-30; Figs. 7 and 8)).

While Saito discloses determination of received mail to be a delivery notification, Saito does not disclose a storage device configured to store a registered destination address to which a mail delivery notification is to be sent, wherein said destination address is registered in said storage device prior to reception of said received delivery notification. However, as mentioned above regarding claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). A delivery notifying destination mail address is registered, prior to receiving said electronic delivery confirmation mail (Fig. 9, step 154; column 10, lines 53-60). Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught

by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

Regarding claim 57, Saito discloses a network facsimile apparatus comprising: a detecting part configured to detect, at a time of receiving electronic mail, whether the received electronic mail is an electronic delivery confirmation mail for confirming mail delivery (Internet facsimile and e-mail reception method (note title); delivery status notification mail recognition section judges whether or not received data contains any delivery status notification message (column 8, lines 7-16)); and a processing part configured to determine whether said confirmation mail includes contents relating to a transferring error (delivery status notification mail in Saito includes a delivery status notification message indicating that the data received is delivery status notification mail (column 6, lines 14-24); delivery status notification mail identification section judges the received data (column 6, lines 25-30) and specific information extraction section extracts information on the success/failure of delivery (column 6, lines 31-38)).

While Saito discloses determination of received mail to be a delivery notification, Saito does not disclose memory means for storing a registered destination address to which a mail delivery notification is to be sent. However, as mentioned above regarding claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step 110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). A delivery notifying destination mail address is registered, prior to receiving said

electronic delivery confirmation mail (Fig. 9, step 154; column 10, lines 53-60).

Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

Claim 58 further recites visibly outputting the contents of said electronic delivery confirmation mail. As mentioned above, Nickerson's facsimile apparatus is capable of printing a confirmation page locally (Fig. 7, step 112).

6. Claims 11 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Nickerson as applied to claims 9 and 36 above, respectively, and further in view of Satomi.

Claim 11 further recites first setting means for making valid or invalid said electronic mail transferring operation of said delivery confirmation mail processing means; and second setting means for making valid or invalid visible display of said electronic mail of said delivery confirmation mail processing means. Claim 39 similarly recites setting means for making valid or invalid the visible display of said delivery notification by said outputting means. Nickerson teaches the first setting means (local

confirmation of the transmission job if remote confirmation is not invoked (Fig. 7, steps 110, 112). The second setting means, while not disclosed by either Saito or Nickerson, is disclosed in Satomi (in response to depression of a predetermined function key, an error report is prepared only if a communication error takes place (column 3, line 58 – column 4, line 2; column 4, lines 29-41)). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching of Saito and Nickerson, by providing second setting means as disclosed by Satomi, so as to prevent a waste of recording paper for printing out an error report in the case where no errors are found in the transmission.

7. Claims 30-32 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Nickerson and Satomi.

Claims 30 and 31 further recite determining means for determining whether a received delivery notification includes error information which indicates an error occurrence; and mail transferring means for transferring the received delivery notification to the registered destination address, according to the determination result of the determining means, wherein the mail transferring means transfers the received delivery notification to the destination address when the delivery notification contains error information. Claim 54 further recites a processing part configured to determine whether a received delivery notification contains error information which indicates an error occurrence, and transfer the received delivery notification to the registered destination address, according to the determination result. As mentioned above, the delivery status notification mail in Saito includes a delivery status notification message

indicating that the data received is delivery status notification mail (column 6, lines 14-24). The delivery status notification mail identification section judges the received data (column 6, lines 25-30) and specific information extraction section extracts information on the success/failure of delivery (column 6, lines 31-38). Furthermore, as mentioned regarding claim 9, Nickerson discloses a facsimile apparatus that is capable of providing remote confirmation of job completion (Fig. 7, step-110; Fig. 8, step 124), wherein destination addresses to which a confirmation is to be delivered are stored (Fig. 8, steps 130, 134) and delivery of confirmation mail to the destination addresses is performed (Fig. 7, step 114). Nickerson recognized that when a user is away from a transmission job originating station, he or she cannot immediately determine whether or not the transmission job was successfully completed, thereby causing delays in correcting potential faults in the transmission job (column 2, lines 15-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Saito, by providing delivery notifying partner storing means and delivery confirmation mail transferring means, such as taught by Nickerson, so that potential faults in the transmission job can be corrected in a more timely fashion.

The transfer of the received delivery notification in Nickerson does not appear to be based on a determination of whether an error has occurred. However, as mentioned above regarding claim 11, Saito discloses selective output of an error report based on whether a transmission error has occurred (in response to depression of a predetermined function key, an error report is prepared only if a communication error takes place (column 3, line 58 - column 4, line 2; column 4, lines 29-41)). In

combination with Saito and Nickerson, this teaching would enable selective transfer of an error report to a remote location if a communication error occurs, and such combination would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, so as to prevent a waste of recording paper for printing out an error report in the case where no errors are found in the transmission.

Claim 32 further recites setting means for making valid or invalid said electronic mail transferring operation of said mail transferring means. As mentioned above, Nickerson provides for local confirmation of the transmission job if remote confirmation is not invoked (Fig. 7, steps 110, 112). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide means for making valid or invalid the electronic transferring operation so that a user can immediately receive results of the transmission, whether locally or at a remote location.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 21-29, 33-35, 40-53 and 56 are allowed.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As mentioned in the prior Office action, no prior art has been found to disclose or suggest "transferring said delivery confirmation mail confirmed by said confirming means to a mail address set in a From address field, when a mail address of a sender is set in said From address field of said delivery confirmation mail, and for transferring said delivery confirmation mail to the destination address, when the mail address of the sender individual is not set in said From address field of said electronic mail," as recited in base claim 2 and similarly recited in base claims 14, 22 and 40; or "transferring said



electronic delivery confirmation mail to both said mail address set in said From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail and said destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means when said delivery confirmation mail includes predetermined contents relating to said transferring error contained in said electronic delivery confirmation mail and when said mail address of the sender is set in the From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail; for transferring said electronic delivery confirmation mail to said destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means when said delivery confirmation mail includes predetermined contents relating to said transferring error contained in said electronic delivery confirmation mail and when said mail address of the sender is not set in the From address field of said electronic mail; for transferring said electrical delivery confirming mail to said mail address set in said From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail when said predetermined contents relating to said transferring error not contained in said electronic delivery confirmation mail and when said mail address of the sender is set in the From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail; for transferring said electronic delivery confirmation to said destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means when said predetermined contents relating to said transferring error are not contained in the contents of said electronic delivery confirmation mail and when said mail address of the sender individual is not set in the From address of said electronic delivery confirmation mail," as recited in base claim 4 and similarly recited in base claims 10, 16, 18, 42 and 44; or "confirming, when said received electronic mail is the electronic delivery

confirmation mail for confirming the delivery, whether a mail address of a sender is set in a From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail; transferring said electronic delivery confirmation mail to said stored destination mail address, when mail address of the sender is not set in the From address field of said electronic delivery confirmation mail," as recited in base claim 17; or "determining means for determining whether a received delivery notification contains a sender address in a From address field; and mail transferring means for transferring the received delivery notification according to the determination result of the determining means," as recited in base claim 26 and similarly recited in base claim 46; or "first determining means for determining whether a received delivery notification contains a sender address in the From address field; second determining means for determining whether the received delivery notification contains error information which indicates an error occurrence; and mail transferring means for transferring the received delivery notification according to the determination result of the first and second determining means," as recited in base claim 33 and similarly recited in base claim 50.

No prior art has been found to disclose or suggest Applicant's "delivery confirmation mail transferring means for determining whether the delivery confirmation mail indicates successful mail delivery, and for transferring said delivery confirmation mail confirmed by said confirming means to said destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means when the delivery confirmation mail indicates successful mail delivery," as recited in base claim 1 and as similarly recited in base claims 13, 21, 24, 53 and 56; or "delivery confirmation mail transferring means for

determining whether said delivery confirmation mail includes contents relating to a transferring error and for transferring said electronic delivery confirmation mail to the destination address stored in said delivery notifying partner storing means, when the contents relating to the transferring error are not contained in the delivery confirmation mail," as recited in base claim 3 and as similarly recited in base claim 23.

### ***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone

Application/Control Number:  
10/801,400  
Art Unit: 2625

Page 19

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thomas D Lee  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Division 2625

tdl  
December 17, 2007